

REMARKS:

In the forgoing amendments, limitations from elected and allowed claim 7 were inserted into non-elected independent claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 17, 25, and 26 for placing these claims in condition for allowance. Claim 27 was canceled, and claims 9 and 11 were previously canceled. Accordingly, claims 1 – 8, 10, 12 – 26, and 28 – 32 are pending in the application. The Examiner withdrew claims 1 – 6 and 17 – 32 from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. The Examiner previously examined claims 7, 8, 10, and 12 – 16 on the merits. In light of the foregoing amendments and for the following reasons, Applicants respectfully request that all pending claims 1 – 8, 10, 12 – 26, and 28 – 32 in this application be allowed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Final Office Action mailed January 4, 2011, The Examiner rejected claims 7, 8, 10, and 12 – 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanetake (US 6,303,054) in view of Economy (US 4,467,000) in further view of Hasegawa (*Structure and Properties of Novel Asymmetric Biphenyl Type Polyimides* in *Macromolecules*, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 387 – 396, 1999) and evidenced by Wilson (Polyimide, Blackie & Son Ltd., 1990, pp. 1 – 2, scheme 1.2). Applicants repeatedly traversed this rejection. The latest traversal appeared in the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review filed on June 6, 2011. The Notice of Panel Decision from Pre-Appeal Brief Review mailed July 27, 2011 stated that this rejection was withdrawn.

Telephone Interview

Applicants greatly appreciate the courtesies extended the undersigned by Examiner Shane Fang in telephone interviews on September 16, 20, and 21, 2011. During the first telephone

interview, the Examiner advised the undersigned that prosecution on the merits was reopened and the above-mentioned §103 rejection over Kanetake, Economy, Hasegawa, and Wilson was withdrawn. The Examiner stated that the remaining issues to be resolved are the provisional double patenting rejection and rejoinder of the non-elected claims 1 – 6 and 17 – 32. The Examiner agreed that filing a terminal disclaimer, such as that filed herewith and discussed in the next section, would overcome the provisional double patenting rejection. In addition, the Examiner agreed that amending independent claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 17, 25, and 26 to include the limitations of claim 7 would result in the rejoinder of withdrawn claims 1 – 6 and 17 – 32 with elected claims 7, 8, 10, and 12-16, so that all pending claims 1 – 8, 10, and 12 – 26 and 28 – 32 would be allowed at this time

Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 7, 8, 10, and 12 – 16 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 4 – 8 of copending application No. 12/441,980. While Applicants do not agree with this rejection, Applicants are submitting an appropriate terminal disclaimer and the fee therefore together with this amendment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Rejoinder

In order to be eligible for rejoinder, a claim to a nonelected invention must depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable claim (M.P.E.P. §821.04 Rejoinder). In the foregoing amendments, Applicants amended independent claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 17, 25, and 26 to

include the limitations of allowable claim 7. Thus, Applicants claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 17, 25, and 26 and claims 3, 6, 18 – 24, and 28 – 32 that depend thereon meet the requirements for rejoinder. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that withdrawn claims 1 – 6, 17 – 26, and 28 – 32 be rejoined with allowed claims 7, 8, 10, and 12 – 16, so that all pending claims 1 – 8, 10, 12 – 26, and 28 – 32 will be allowed together.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A timely notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If questions relating to patentability remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee therefore, as well as any other fees which become due, may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,
/ R. Eugene Varndell, Jr./
R. Eugene Varndell, Jr.
Reg. No. 29,728

Posz Law Group, PLC
12040 South Lakes Drive
Suite 101
Reston, VA 20191
Phone 703-707-9110
Fax 703-707-9112
Customer No. 23400